S.No.	High Court	Principal Seat	Jurisdiction	Bench
7.	Gauhati	Guwahati	Assam Arunachal Pradesh Manipur Meghalaya Mizoram Nagaland and Tripura	 Agartala Aizwal Imphal Itanagar Kohima Shillong
8.	Gujarat	Sola, Ahmedabad	Gujarat	—
9.	Himachal Pradesh	Shimla	Himachal Pradesh	—
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	Jammu and Srinagar	Jammu & Kashmir	—
11.	Jharkhand	Ranchi	Jharkhand	—
12.	Karnataka	Bangalore	Karnataka	—
13.	Kerala	Kochi	Kerala and Lakshadweep Islands	—
14.	Madhya Pradesh	Jabalpur	Madhya Pradesh	Gwalior Indore
15.	Madras	Chennai	Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry	Madurai
16.	Orissa	Cuttack	Orissa	—
17.	Patna	Patna	Bihar	—
18.	Punjab and Haryana	Chandigarh	Punjab, Haryana and U.T. of Chandigarh	—
19.	Rajasthan	Jodhpur	Rajasthan	Jaipur
20.	Sikkim	Gangtok	Sikkim	—
21.	Uttaranchal	Nainital	Uttaranchal	—

Non-implementation of court orders

3348. SHRI DARA SINGH CHAUHAN: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to refer to reply to Unsarred Question 1108 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 13th December, 2004 and state:

(a) the status of the writ petition including the reasons for its non-implementation;

(b) whether Government are aware that the petitioners are almost on their death bed due to old age and sickness and are not in a position to go through the exhaustive legal remedies;

(c) what action has been taken against the official responsible for this sorry state of affairs;

(d) if not, the reasons therefor; and

(e) by when relief is likely to be granted to the petitioners?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI K. VENKATAPATHY): (a) to (e) Under Article 215 of the Constitution of India, every High Court shall be a court of record and shall have all the powers of such a court including the power to punish for contempt of itself. The orders of Allahabad High Court in the WP No. 2757 of 1995 has to be implemented by the Government of Uttaranchal. Central Government has no role to play in the matter. The High Court has the power to, *suo moto*, take the cognizance of its contempt by the State Government.

Permanent Lok Adalats

3349. SHR R.K. ANAND: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that most of the States/UTs have not established permanent Lok Adalats; and

(b) if so, the measures taken by Government to make available speedy, inexpensive and substantial justice to common man?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI K. VENKATAPATHY): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. Continuous Lok Adalats u/s 19 of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 have been established in almost all the States. However, Permanent Lok Adalats for the Public Utility Services u/s 22B of the Legal Services Authorities (Amended) Act, 2002 have been established only in four States *viz.* Haryana, Jharkhand, Rajasthan and U.T. of Chandigarh. The State Governments of Delhi, Karnataka and Punjab have also cleared the proposal of their State Legal Services Authorities for establishment of Permanent Lok Adalats u/s 22B of Legal Services Authorities for establishment of Permanent Lok Sabha Adalats u/s 22B of Legal Services Authorities (Amendment) Act, 2002. In the remaining States, proposals for such Permanent Lok Adalats are pending with their respective State Government. National Legal Services Authority has also taken up the issue with the State Governments.